

13/10/62
and so on

II. Introduction

1. Para. 2, delete 1st sentence.

-- "powerful strategic base" is somewhat loaded. Report should be factual in tone.

2. Para. 2, 3, 4 - Did "Troops" to man SAM's arrive with SAM's?

3. I did not hear of the armored Task Forces until after October 22. Are we now sure that armored "troops" arrived this early? Any reports distributed? By dumping armor and SAM's implication is we knew about both. I did not.

4. Paragraph 7 -- This paragraph mixes statements like (P.5) "Sov. armored Task Forces were deployed..." and P.6 "A truck-convoy, probably carrying MREB's was seen in Havana," -- e.g., it mixes reconstruction with what we knew at the time. -- Only the first type of statement should be used -- i.e., "12 Sept: truck convoys, probably carrying MREB's, began to depart Havana, or some such."

Page 8

Paragraph 9 is not appropriate to the intro, which is a reconstruction of events in Cuba. It belongs in V, or some such later section.

III. Collection Requirements

Page 11, paragraph 8. I do not understand the last sentence.

IV. Sources and Collection Facilities

Paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6

Paragraph 3 does not say how many

Paragraph 6, last sentence, says "a number are still active". All this is misleading. How many? Can't judge effectiveness w/o numbers. Especially since many facts and figures are given about number of refugees, overflights, etc.

Paragraph 7, p. 14. says that agents "observed the arrival of Soviet military units." Were these reports distributed? I first heard of armored groups after October 22, as a result of COMMINT activities.

Paragraph 18, p. 17 I think the generalization -- "weather and policy considerations were limiting factors..." -- belongs in the later section, not here in a description of "Sources and Collection Facilities."

V. Reporting on the Build-up

This section is misleading. It lumps together reports that are "specifically descriptive" of offensive weapons and that are "suggestive." We should distinguish and give numbers.

E.g., paragraph 5, last sentence, should be changed to read x reports specifically descriptive and x reports describing unusual or suggestive activity (which, for example, could have been an intercept station, which we all fully expected.

Paragraph 6 stress on "unusual" etc., implies, with hindsight, that we should have expected missiles. Fewer adjectives would be good. Also, last sentence, unless my memory fails me several of the intelligence publications for some time regarded the build-up not as "unprecedented" but as roughly comparable to the arms aid to Indonesia. This should be checked.

Paragraph 9, p. 21 -- The second sentence implies that 7 reports dealt with MRBM/IRBMs and that they proved correct. Were these 7 about SAM's or offensive missiles? Were they correct or proved false?

3rd sentence. Same questions apply to the 40 reports. I can find only 3 reports specifically descriptive of missiles that were distributed prior to October 14.

If we say "6 reports relating to IL 28's and 4 relating to MIG 21's". We should give numbers in MRBM/IRBM reports, too.

Paragraph 10, p. 21-22 -- The phrase following (B) coupled with the first sentence of the paragraph (reports from every province of Cuba) implies many reports of trailers with "massive tubular objects." Not so. Many reports that did in fact describe SA-2's. Two or three that talked of something longer.

Paragraph 11 to Para. 12 are inconsistent -- "reports received soon thereafter" and "appreciable delay."

Paragraph 12, last sentence. Doesn't this belong in the section on overflights?

Paragraph 13, last sentence. I think the important interval is between the time that recon could have could have identified missiles and the time they were in fact identified.

VI. Dissemination of the Reports

Paragraph 1 I saw only 1 or 2 of the 3 concerned with MRBM/IRBM's.

I would like a paragraph added explaining in greater detail failure to disseminate such reports as CSDB-3/651,856 and CSDB 3/651,864.

VII. Processing and Analysis

Paragraph 2, "Timely" rather than "accurate"?

Paragraph 2, last sentence. Does the intelligence community want to say this in this way? The President's statement tended to alert and sensitize everybody. The NIE actually said "we must be alert."

Paragraph 6, add ARA and top levels of Dept.?

Paragraph 13 No roundup or survey memo was distributed analyzing all the reports dealing with "unusual security," "denied areas" etc. -- i.e., lots of new bits and pieces, but no disseminated "thoughtful analysis." Wasn't this failure? (This also applies to last sentence paragraphs 26, 27. No such analysis of the pattern came to me.)

VIII. The Intelligence Publications

Paragraph 9 talks about the reasons behind order. Is this appropriate for USIB or more appropriate for Killian and White House?

Paragraph 9 - 14. Should this be checked with White House, etc.?

Paragraph 22 - Crates, not bombers. There was some debate, although most analysts convinced.

Paragraph 27. The whole argument on dissemination is not very credible.

IX. The Estimates

Paragraph 8 - Inconsistent with pp. 26-27?

The text, although not the conclusion, also said we should be alert. Include this?

X Chronology of Cuban U-2 Overflights

Should this section be checked with other members of the S.G., making it a joint USIB/SG document?

Paragraph 17 period after "means" delete "since".
New sentence beginning with "Peripheral."

XI Summary of Community Actions

Paragraph 14 and 15. I think it should be noted that INR was not consulted on this matter and did not even know of the existence of the paper.

Paragraph 35. Dissemination date?

Paragraph 38. The flavor of the report should be included along with the judgment.

XII Draft Conclusions

I wonder whether we ought not to leave conclusions to the Killian board.